

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated September 30, 2002. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph for containing indefinite language. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments and are now believed to conform to 35 U.S.C. 112. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 1-5, 9-15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baedke (USP 5,316,106). Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baedke '106 in view of Gabelli '748. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following comments.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Baedke '106 fails to disclose the "cooler 100" of the present invention. The Examiner asserts that the axle tubes meet the limitation of a cooler as set forth in the original claims. Applicant has amended claim 1 to specifically recite a cooler that is disposed external to the at least one of the axle tubes. Original claim 11 recites an arrangement where the cooler is disposed on the axle tube. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest such an arrangement. Baedke '106 discloses an axle tube but fails to disclose any cooler mounted on the axle tube. For this reason, the current claims are allowable over the art of record.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-20 are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:

By: 

Matthew Stavish  
Reg. No. 36,286

Liniak Berenato & White  
6550 Rock Spring Drive  
Suite 240  
Bethesda, Maryland 20817  
(301) 896-0600